

FORM PTO-1449
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 12078-202

APPLICATION SERIAL NO.: N/A

GROUP ART UNIT: N/A

APPLICANT: Michael A. Heaton, et al.

EXAMINER: N/A

FILING DATE: Herewith

CONFIRMATION NO.: N/A


U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	NAME	CLASS/SUB- CLASS	FILING DATE IF APPROPRIATE
<i>Lev</i>	4,756,866	07/12/88	Alvarez	376/157	
<i>Lev</i>	4,864,142	09/05/89	Gomberg	250/390.04	
<i>Lev</i>	5,319,547	06/07/94	Krug et al.	364/409	
<i>Lev</i>	5,367,552	11/22/94	Peschmann	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	5,479,023	12/26/95	Bartle	250/390.04	
<i>Lev</i>	5,600,303	02/04/97	Husseiny et al.	340/568	
<i>Lev</i>	5,600,700	02/04/97	Krug et al.	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	5,642,393	06/24/97	Krug et al.	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	5,692,029	11/25/97	Husseiny et al.	378/88	
<i>Lev</i>	5,838,759	11/17/98	Armistead	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	5,974,111	10/26/99	Krug et al.	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	6,026,340	02/15/00	Corrado et al.	701/47	
<i>Lev</i>	6,035,014	03/07/00	Hiraoglu et al.	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	6,088,423	07/11/00	Krug et al.	378/57	
<i>Lev</i>	6,370,222*	04/09/02	Cornick Jr.	378/57	01/31/00
<i>Lev</i>	6,430,255*	08/06/02	Fenkart et al.	378/57	02/26/01
<i>Lev</i>	6,515,582*	02/04/03	Teowee et al.	340/426.1	09/18/00
<i>Lev</i>	RE 37,899*	11/05/02	Grodzins et al.	378/86	12/08/99
<i>Lev</i>	2002/0018542 A1*	02/14/02	Fenkart et al.	378/57	02/26/01
<i>Lev</i>	2002/0071524 A1*	06/13/02	Renkart et al.	378/199	02/07/02
<i>Lev</i>	2002/0097835 A1*	07/25/02	Fenkart et al.	378/57	02/07/02
<i>Lev</i>	2002/0172324 A1*	11/21/02	Ellengogen	378/57	04/03/02


FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

EXAMINER INITIAL	DOCUMENT NO.	DATE	NAME	CLASS/SUB- CLASS	TRANSLATION YES NO

OTHER DOCUMENTS
(Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, etc.)

	U.S. Provisional Patent Application Serial No.: 60/425,615 filed 11/11/02 for Robert Finch et al., entitled: Explosive Detection System and Methods Using Sequenced Technologies.

* These patents are representative of the state of the art but published after or less than one year prior to Applicant's priority date. Therefore, if any such item is considered sufficiently relevant by the Examiner to the present invention, its possible "prior art" status against the present invention should be considered individually allowing for the prospect of swearing back or other priority determination.

EXAMINER  DATE CONSIDERED 4/22/05
